

not stand still, given man's thirst for learning and his talent for technology. If we in the West have learned anything in these recent eventful years, it is that change is bad only if it occurs through violent convulsions and that the essential thing is to see that it is accomplished in a peaceful, progressive, orderly, step-by-step way.

At about the same time, the leadership in Eastern Europe, presented with the same facts, appeared to be coming to some of the same conclusions. There thus began the slow, sometimes awkward, crab-like approach towards a new relationship, which is commonly called "*détente*" in the West and "peaceful coexistence" in Communist terminology. There are still many in East and West who look back at the relative stability of the last quarter-century, and conclude that two armed and guarded camps are the most essential element of safety. But I believe that realistic people looking ahead into the last quarter of this century know that some modification in this approach will be necessary.

What sort of modification? That is the big question-mark that hangs over the *détente* process at this important stage of East-West relations. From the point of view of Canadians (and not only Canadians, I believe), it will not be good enough if the answer is the mere replacement of opposing armed camps of steel with closed camps of the mind. While there may be a stability of sorts through mutual deterrence, there can be little prospect of peaceful change and development in a mutually-antagonistic political and intellectual life. Some call for peaceful coexistence of systems and governments -- and that is certainly part of what we are all looking for. But coexistence without an element of change -- without the ability to adjust to our rapidly-developing world and its new challenges -- will bring a rigidity and even a brittleness that cannot help but endanger both sides. As my predecessor said in his address at Helsinki:

"There must be a broader and more dynamic concept of coexistence of people as well as states, of ideas and way of life as well as of regimes and systems. How, otherwise, can they enrich one another and promote the ideals of mankind? Otherwise we shall have only uneasy existence in which real *détente* -- lasting and rewarding for all -- will be impossible."

This, then, is the outlook with which we have approached the negotiating process that has now reached a decisive stage at the